

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
<p>GEF ID:10803 Project Title: Reduction of Unintentional POPs through waste management in a circular economy Date of Screening: May 18, 2021 STAP member screener: Saleem H. Ali STAP secretariat screener: Sunday Leonard STAP's overall assessment: --- Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>This project builds on earlier World Bank engagement on environmental performance improvements in Lebanon by reducing unintentional persistent organic pollution (UPOP) from waste burning and leakage from municipal waste management systems through improved waste recovery as well as the implementation of "Green Chemistry" approaches. Overall, the project aims to help Lebanon develop capacity towards having a more circular economy of production and consumption.</p> <p>While these goals are well-articulated at a conceptual level, the project's theory of change (Annex 1 of the project concept note) does not provide the specific step linkages to attain the objectives described. For example, "Green Chemistry" was mentioned and footnoted with its twelve-point framework as well as "Extended Producer Responsibility," but it is unclear how a particular industrial sector will be approached. There is no clear industry partnership noted (except for a brief mention of the agro-food sector). This is particularly important for this type of project.</p> <p>The proponents may have this information, but it is not provided. Before approval, there must be clarity given on the implementation regimen and theory of change, especially with the fragile situation in the country and ensuring donor funds are efficiently utilized.</p> <p>The theory of change should be improved to incorporate the assumptions and the causative pathways that will lead to the desired outcome. STAP's theory of change primer (https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer) can be a helpful guide in this regard.</p> <p>While the project components include developing policy frameworks and regulatory instruments and introducing BATs/BEPs, which are part of core indicators for the GEF's chemicals and waste focal area, this was not mentioned in the core indicator section of the PIF (indicators 10.1 and 10.2). These indicators should be updated as appropriate.</p> <p>An estimated 20 gTEQ is provided as the expected Global Environment Benefits (GEBs) from the project. With GEF investment totaling \$8,858,447 for all project components and management, that is about \$442,922.35 per gTEQ of uPOP emissions avoided. Using only the budget for Component 2, which involves demonstrations (\$5,000,000 of GEF investment), the cost per gTEQ of uPOP emissions avoided will be \$2,500,000. These are high costs of uPOP avoidance. This is because the range of possible POP reduction from the project is not fully accounted for. For example, implementing green chemistry, extended producer responsibility, and green public procurement, as intended under Component 1, will reduce waste generation and ensure that hazardous chemicals, including POPs, are avoided in products, leading to eliminating POPs. This potential POP avoidance from these measures, therefore, needs to be incorporated.</p>	

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
		<p>Further on GEBs, it is commendable that the proponent noted the potential for the project to generate greenhouse gas emissions benefits. An estimate of possible emissions reduction should also be included in the project's core indicators (GEF Core Indicator 6).</p> <p>A crucial missing element in the proposed project interventions is catalyzing behavior change. How organizations, including public and private sectors, and individuals respond to new waste management processes and solutions is essential to success as implementing the new approaches and technologies. It is therefore important to incorporate behavioral change elements into the proposed activities. We recommend that the proponent review STAP's recent advisory on behavior change, which highlights six strategic levers for changing behavior, to help provide further insight into designing this component. (https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/why-behavior-change-matters-gef-and-what-do-about-it).</p> <p>The possible impact of climate change on the project was recognized, and an analysis of the climate risk was presented using World Bank's climate risk and disaster risk screening tool. The screening result shows a high exposure rating of project location and physical infrastructure and assets to climate change. The climate risk mitigation measures are, however, not presented. We encourage this to be done before the project proceeds.</p> <p>We would also recommend that the proponents refer to the following readings that show existing research in this arena so that redundant consultancies are not recruited for Phase 1 of the project. Instead, the investment is direct at project implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chalhoub, Michel Soto. "Public Policy and Technology Choices for Municipal Solid Waste Management a Recent Case in Lebanon." Edited by Keng Yuen Foo. <i>Cogent Environmental Science</i> 4, no. 1 (January 1, 2018): 1529853. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311843.2018.1529853. • Maalouf, Amani, and Mutasem El-Fadel. "Life Cycle Assessment for Solid Waste Management in Lebanon: Economic Implications of Carbon Credit." <i>Waste Management & Research</i> 37, no. 1_suppl (January 1, 2019): 14–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734242X18815951. • Massoud, May A., Michel Mokbel, and Suheir Alawieh. "Reframing Environmental Problems: Lessons from the Solid Waste Crisis in Lebanon." <i>Journal of Material Cycles and Waste Management</i> 21, no. 6 (2019): 1311–20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10163-019-00884-8. • Ali, S and Leonard, S.A. 2021. The Circular Economy and Climate Mitigation and the Circular. A STAP Advisory Document. Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel to the Global Environment Facility. Washington, DC. • Katima, J. and Leonard, S. 2020. Delivering Multiple Benefits through the Sound Management of Chemicals and Waste. A STAP Advisory Document. Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel to the Global Environment Facility. Washington, DC.
<p>Part I: Project Information B. Indicative Project Description Summary</p>		

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Not adequately – the objectives need to be linked to more actionable items.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Partially
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits? Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated?	The project terms "global benefits" and also provides an estimate for 20g TEQ/ a UPOP emission to air, about 50% over 2014 levels. However, how this target would be met is not clear at all nor have citations or scenarios been presented on the project's ability to achieve this.
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	This is provided but as noted the incremental theory of change is missing and hence hard to determine how the targets would be met.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
1. Project description. Briefly describe: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Is the problem statement well-defined? Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references? For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?	Yes – this is adequately presented.
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly? Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes, there are citations to earlier studies and materials provided.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	<p>Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?</p> <p>For multiple focal area projects: are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators; are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and how did these lessons inform the design of this project?</p>	
<p>3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project</p>	<p>What is the theory of change? What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives? • Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions? • Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes? 	<p>The theory of change should be improved to incorporate the assumptions and the causative pathways that will lead to the desired outcome. STAP's theory of change primer (https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer) can be a helpful guide in this regard.</p>
<p>5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing</p>	<p>GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits? LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?</p>	<p>Partially presented</p>

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	<p>Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?</p> <p>Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?</p> <p>Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?</p> <p>Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?</p> <p>What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?</p>	Yes – if there is overall reduction in UPOPs, the impacts can be global.
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	<p>Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?</p> <p>Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?</p> <p>Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?</p>	Green Chemistry could be an innovation but there is inadequate elaboration of how this would be set forth and only a couple of sentences on innovation are provided.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		
2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p> <p>What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles</p>	There is a detailed addendum social review provided as per World bank templates.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
<p>organizations; Private sector entities.</p> <p>If none of the above, please explain why.</p> <p>In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>	<p>contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?</p>	
<p>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</p> <p>Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/ tbd.</p> <p>If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services.</p> <p>Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p> <p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	<p>Yes, there is a description of the gender disparities in country but how this could be addressed is not provided. For example, the project might bring in women-owned businesses into 3R etc. or partner with particular civil society groups involved in such issues.</p>
<p>5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives</p>	<p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?</p>	<p>Yes, there is a detailed pro forma assessment as per World Bank templates.</p> <p>Climate risk screening is also provided. Mitigation measures need to be developed.</p>

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
<p>from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design</p>	<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project? For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately? • Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? • Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? • What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? 	
<p>6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives</p>	<p>Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects? Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them? Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited? How have these lessons informed the project's formulation? Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?</p>	<p>Private sector engagement should have been noted more clearly given that this involves waste reduction efforts which has a direct industry nexus.</p>

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
<p>8. Knowledge management. Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used? What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>Material is noted on databases and government repositories of information which could be linked.</p>

STAP's advisory response

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<p>1. Concur</p>	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. The proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement. * In cases where the STAP acknowledges the project has merit on scientific and technical grounds, the STAP will recognize this in the screen by stating that <i>"STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design."</i></p>
<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to: (i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>
<p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to: (i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>